DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 023 320 FL 000 400

Experiment in French Language Instruction. Second Report.
Antioch Coll., Yellow Springs, Ohio.
Pub Date Oct 60
Note-28p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.50
Descriptors-Academic Achievement, *Audiovisual Aids, *College Language Programs, *Course Evaluation, *Experimental Programs, *French, Instructional Innovation, Instructional Materials, Language Instruction, Language Proficiency, Language Skills, Student Attitudes, Tables (Data), Teacher Rating, Teaching Assistants
Identifiers-Antioch College

This report evaluates the second year of Antioch College's experimental French I course, which features the use of student assistants and acetate audiovisual aids for laboratory work. The bulk of the report consists of appendixes that contain most of the data on both exper

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Experiment in French Language Instruction

SECOND REPORT

1959-1960

FL 000 400

ED023320

ANTIOCH COLLEGE
Yellow Springs, Ohio

October, 1960

EXPERIMENT IN FRENCH LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION

Report No. 2
Antioch College, 1959-1960

This is a report on the second year of Antioch College's experimentation in the use of new teaching procedures in French language instruction. It supplements an earlier study report submitted for the 1958-59 school year.

The principal purpose of the studies has been to see whether the College could develop new methods in its program of French language instruction that would enable it to improve the quality of instruction, while at the same time achieving greater economies in the costs of instruction. The studies have been conducted with the aid of a grant from the Fund for the Advancement of Education.

The new teaching procedures were developed by Herman Schnurer, Chairman of the Department of Languages and Professor of French. The study has been under the direction of Samuel Baskin, Director of Educational Research at Antioch College, and Robert Boyd, Assistant Professor of Education. Other staff members participating in the study include Edward Clark, Audiovisual Librarian, who served as audiovisual consultant to the study group; Mrs. Corinne Barger, who assisted Mr. Clark and who helped in the development of many of the study materials; and Mrs. Monique Verger-Roeth, Miss Mary Ann Oliveau, Miss Doris Jackson, and Mrs. Sheila Lindgren, who served as student laboratory assistants and conducted all laboratory classes. Mrs. Ruth Churchill, College Examiner, helped in the planning of the evaluation procedures used in the study. W. B. Alexander, Dean of the Faculty, and Morris Keeton, Chairman of the College's Educational Policy Committee, served in an advisory capacity in the planning and development of the study.

* * * * *

o

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
The First Year of Experimentation: Overview and Background	2
The Second Year of the Study: 1959-1960	4
The Comparability of the Groups	5
Post-Course Measures Employed	6
The Achievement of the Groups	6
Student Attitudes Toward the Teaching Procedures Employed	8
Summary of Findings	9
Plans for Further Study: Application to Other Settings	10
Appendices	

(continued)

Table of Contents. cont'd.

APPENDICES

		Page
APPENDIX A		
Table I	The Comparability of the Groups: On Measures of Scholastic Ability and French Language Skills	(1)
Table II	The Comparability of the Groups: On Year Level, Background Experience in French, and Male-Female Distribution Within Each Group	(2)
Table III	The Analysis of the Groups by Subdivisions Within Each Group	(3)
Table IV	The Achievements of the Groups	(5)
Table V	Analysis of the Achievements of the Experimental and Control Classes by Subgroups Within Each Class	(6)
	a): Standardized Instruments: College Board Achievement Test, Antioch Language Placement Test, and Cooperative French Listening Test	
	b): Tape-Recorded Tests of Comprehension, Reading, and Speaking Ability:	(8)
Table VI	Gain Scores of Experimental and Control Groups on the Antioch Language Placement Test	(11)
Table VII	Student Attitudes Toward the Control and Experimental Procedures	(12)
APPENDIX B	Teacher Rating Scale	(13)
APPENDIX C	Background Data Sheet	(14)

The First Year of Experimentation: Overview and Background

The purpose and background of the study has been dealt with in some detail in the first study report.[1] Briefly, the experiment sought to determine whether the College could, through a reorganization of its language teaching procedures and the development of new audiovisual aids for language instruction, improve the quality of its language program while at the same time achieve new economies in the use of its language teaching personnel. The new program in language instruction reorganized the teaching procedure so that a major portion of the classroom time previously conducted by the instructor was handled by two student laboratory assistants. These assistants worked from a series of previously prepared lesson units which had been drawn directly on acetate visuals or transparencies, and which were mounted for use with an overhead projector. These acetate lesson units accompanied by tape recorded sound formed the basic instructional materials for French I. Instructional time saved under the new method approximated twelve hours per week at each level of French (French I, II, and III). A detailed breakdown of the time savings achieved under the new instructional pattern is shown below.[2]

---

[1] Experiment in French Language Instruction, Antioch College, Fund for the Advancement of Education, 1958-59.

[2]

Regular Method of Instruction (Assuming an enrollment of sixty students)	Experimental Method of Instruction
3 separate sects. of 20 each; students meet for 1 hr. 5 times a week with instructor, and are expected to do 16 hours of outside work.	1 sect. of 60 students meets twice a week with instr.(total of 3 hrs.), 4 times a week with student lab.assist. with each lab.session 1½ hrs. Students expected to do 11 hrs. outside work.
Total in and out of class time required of students: 21 hours.	
Total supervised instr. time received by students: 5 hrs.	Total supervised instr. time received by students: 9 hrs.(3instr.,6lab ass.)
Total instr. contact hrs. to handle 60 students: 15 hrs. (3 sects. meet 5 times a week)	Total number of instr. contact hrs.to handle 60 students: 3 hrs.(1 sect. meets 2 times a week with instructor)

The design of the study called for the employment of control and experimental groups to be taught by the conventional and the experimental methods, with each group held responsible for covering the same course materials and meeting the same course objectives. Both groups were matched on a number of variables, and a series of pre- and post-tests was administered in order to determine whether there were differences in the achievement levels of the control and experimental groups. In addition, a teacher rating scale was employed in an attempt to check on student satisfactions and dissatisfactions with both the regular and experimental teaching procedures. Two major hypotheses were presented:

1) That students participating in an experimental course in French I, which made use of certain audiovisual and workbook materials and which was taught in large part by specially trained student assistants, would demonstrate a degree of learning and achievement as great as that of a comparable group of students participating in the regular course in French I but not using the audiovisual and workbook materials and taught in its entirety by the course instructor.

2) That students participating in such an experimental course would demonstrate a degree of satisfaction with the course and the instructor as great as that of a comparable group of students taking the regular course in French I.

The analysis of the 1958-1959 study data indicated that students taught by the experimental procedures performed as well as those taking the course by the regular method of instruction. There was, in fact, some evidence to indicate that the members of the experimental group had generally performed better than the members of the control group as

reflected by: a) the analyses of the mean scores of the groups where the scores of the experimental group exceeded those of control groups on six of eight measures employed, and b) the analyses of "gain" scores of both groups where the scores of members of the experimental group differed significantly from those of the control group. Although not statistically significant, the analyses of student responses on a five point teacher rating scale indicated that in general the members of the experimental class were better satisfied with the course and the teaching methods employed than were the members of the control group. These differences in satisfaction were reflected in the over-all ratings of teaching effectiveness, where the scores of the experimental group exceeded those of the control group, and in the analyses of the individual items on the teacher rating scale where the members of the experimental group rated the instructor higher on four of the five items employed.

* * * * *

The Second Year of the Study: 1959-1960

In testing the new methods of instruction for a second successive year, the study for 1959-60 sought to take advantage of the experiences of the first year's study. The plan of the study paralleled that of the first year's study in its use of pre- and post-test comparisons of students taking the course under experimental and regular methods of instruction. Based on the first year's study, several modifications were made in the acetate lesson materials and additional laboratory sessions were provided for those students needing special help. A total of thirty-six students comprised the 1959-60 experimental group.

The Comparability of the Groups

Data with respect to the comparability of the groups is presented in Table I of the Appendix. Members of the experimental group were compared with the previous year's control groups on tests of scholastic ability as measured by the Verbal Skills Examination of the College Board Entrance Examination and the Vocabulary Test of English Skills, and on French Language Skills as measured by the Antioch Placement Test. No statistically significant differences were found between the groups on each of these measures of comparability. In addition to these measures, two additional analyses were made: Members of the experimental and control groups were re-grouped by subdivisions according to year in college, male-female distribution, and background experience in French language in an attempt to see whether any differences existed between the groups when analyzed by these subdivisions; and the groups were then studied as to their proportions of male to female students, freshman to upperclass students, and the number of students with some or no experience in French. Tables II and III of the Appendix present the results of these analyses. As was the case with the over-all measures of comparability applied in Table I, no significant differences were found between the groups when the data was analyzed by the subdivisions of year level, sex, and French language experience as shown in Table II, or by numerical composition and group make-up shown in Table III. All comparisons shown are for the control group of 1958-59, the experimental group of 1958-59 (experimental I) and the experimental group of 1959-60 (experimental II).

Post-Course Measures Employed

As in the previous year's study, a variety of post-test measures was employed in an attempt to check on the achievements of the groups. These measures included:

a) The College Board Entrance Achievement Test in French Reading as a measure of the individual's vocabulary, grammar, and reading comprehension skills.

b) The Cooperative French Listening Comprehension Test as a measure of audio-comprehension.

c) The Antioch Placement Test as a measure of both gain and post-course achievement.

d) Several tape recorded tests of reading and speaking ability.

With the exception of the tape recorded test materials which were developed by the study staff, all measures employed were standardized instruments.

In addition, the teacher rating scale employed in the previous year's study was also used in the present study in an attempt to obtain some estimate of student satisfactions and dissatisfactions with the teaching procedures used. A copy of this scale is included as Appendix B.

The Achievement of the Groups

Data with regard to the achievements of the experimental and control groups is presented in three ways. Table IV* presents an analysis of the post-course achievements of the total groups on each of the measures employed in the study. Table V* presents an analysis of the achievements of the groups where the data is analyzed by subdivisions according to year levels, male-female distribution, and extent of the student's background experience in French at the time of taking the course. Table VI* presents

*see Appendix

an analysis of the data in terms of "gain" scores achieved by the experimental and control groups through a pre- and post-test administration of the Antioch Language Placement test. In all instances comparisons are shown for the control group of 1958-59, the experimental group of 1958-59 (experimental I), and the experimental group of 1959-60 (experimental II). All measures reported on in Tables IV, V, and VI are for French I.

The analysis of the data by these groupings reveals the following findings:

a) On seven of eight major comparisons made between total groups (experimental vs. control) no significant differences were found between the groups. In the one instance where a significant difference was found (Table IV: The Post-Course Achievement of the Experimental and Control Groups, Test of Reading Ability, Tape 1b), this difference favored the experimental groups. As was the case in the previous year's study, mean scores of the experimental group generally exceeded those of the control group.

b) On a variety of comparisons made between subdivisions of the experimental and control groups (freshman control vs. experimental control; upperclass control vs. upperclass experimental, etc.), three comparisons proved to be significant in favor of the experimental groups. All three significant differences occurred on the tape recorded tests of reading ability (Table V, an Analysis of the Achievement of the Experimental and Control by Subgroups Within Each Class, Tapes 1a & b, freshmen vs. freshmen and tape 1b, females vs. females). In all other subgroup comparisons no significant differences were found between the groups.[1]

---

[1]In all comparisons, F ratios were applied as a test of significance. Where significant differences were found, "t" tests were used to determine which pairs differed significantly.

c) While the results of the first experimental year showed a significant difference in "gain scores" in favor of the experimental group, this difference did not hold up when the experiment was applied for a second year. Thus a comparison of the control group with the experimental group of both years indicated that, while the gain scores of the experimental group generally exceeded those of the control group, these differences were not significant at the level of determination set for this experiment (.05).

Student Attitudes Toward the Teaching Procedures Employed

Table VII contains a summary of the results of the comparison of the classes on the Teacher Rating Scale. This scale was employed in an attempt to obtain some measure of student satisfaction and dissatisfaction with the regular and experimental teaching procedures. The table* is to be read so that the lower the score, the higher is the rating.

The analysis of this data indicates that little difference exists between the experimental and control groups with regard to their feelings of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the teaching procedures employed. No significant difference was found in the students' over-all rating of the instructor when comparisons were made between the experimental and control procedures. There were some indications, however, that the members of the experimental group tended to respond more favorably toward the instructional procedures employed than did the members of the control group. This was evidenced by the fact that in the analysis of individual items on the Instructor Rating Scale the experimental course was rated more favorably on nine of twelve comparisons made. In two instances the analysis of the individual items on the Instructor Rating Scale indicated

*see Appendix

significant differences in favor of the experimental group[1]; in one instance, a significant difference was found in favor of the control group[2].

Summary of Findings

The major study findings were as follows:

1. Data from both years of the study on a wide variety of measures indicated that students learned as well by the experimental method of instruction as they did by the conventional procedures. In those areas where significant differences did exist, these differences favored the members of the experimental group.

2. The new methods of instruction were received with considerable enthusiasm by the students. While there were few significant differences in the teacher rating scale, an analysis of individual items on this scale revealed that the members of the experimental group rated the course and the instructor more favorably than did the members of the control group on nine of twelve items on this scale.

3. The new study procedures offered major economies in the use of instructional time. Based on an enrollment of sixty students in French I, French II, and French III, savings of instructional time are approximated at twelve hours per week for each level of French.[3]

---

[1]Item 3 of the Teacher Rating Scale, "Gets you interested in his subject", and Item 5, "Knows subject thoroughly enough to organize course and relate it to others; integrates materials, answers questions".

[2]Item 2 of Teacher Rating Scale, "Displays an active personal interest in you, as by being easy to approach, willing to help."

[3]These savings are in time spent by the regular course instructor in the conduct of the class. While achieving these savings, the new instructional method through its use of student lab. assistants allows for even more instructional time than was heretofore possible.

Plans for Further Study; Application to Other Settings

The new teaching procedures have already been adopted as a part of the College's regular instructional program for French I. The College plans to continue its study of the use of the materials in advanced levels of French, and hopes that it may be able to set up comparable control group studies for evaluation of the new procedures in French II and French III. In addition, with a view toward a broader application of the materials, the College is now studying the materials as to needed adjustments in the hope that they might be adapted for other areas of language instruction, and for use by other colleges and universities.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

TABLE I

The Comparability of the Groups:
On Measures of Scholastic Ability and French Language Skills

Comparison	$\bar{X}$	N	F Ratio	df	Sign.
Scholastic Ability					
Verbal Skills Examination (CBEE)					
Control*	609.87	15			
Experimental I*	574.44	25	1.17	2/71	ns
Experimental II*	571.62	34			
Vocabulary Test of English Skills					
Control	35.53	19			
Experimental I	32.12	26	.93	2/75	ns
Experimental II	31.93	33			
French Language Skills					
Antioch Language Placement Test					
Control	27.50	8			
Experimental I	27.56	9	.19	2/35	ns
Experimental II	29.57	21			

*In every case, Control = Quarter I, 1958-1959
Experimental I = Quarter II, 1958-1959
Experimental II = Quarter I, 1959-1960

TABLE II

The Comparability of the Groups:
On Year Level, Background Experience in French,
and Male-Female Distribution Within Each Group

Comparison*	Control* N	Exp. I* N	Exp. II N	df	x^2	signif.
Year in College						
Freshman	9	22	24	2	1.95	ns
Upperclass	4	4	10			
Background						
Some background	7	9	21	2	4.34	ns
No background	6	17	13			
Sex						
Male	7	14	12	2	2	ns
Female	6	12	22			

---

* N for these measures determined by number in each group taking French Language Placement Test at beginning of course.

N in succeeding tables based on information secured from Background Data Sheet (See Appendix C).

TABLE III

The Analysis of the Groups by Subdivisions Within Each Group

Comparison	$\bar{X}$	N	F	df	Signif.
Year Level					
Freshmen vs. Freshmen					
Verbal Skills Examination (CBEE)					
Control	606.62	8			
Exper. I	577.13	23	.68	2, 52	ns
Exper. II	566.29	24			
Vocabulary Test of English Skills					
Control	32.80	10			
Exper. I	32.22	23	.10	2, 54	ns
Exper. II	31.21	24			
Antioch Language Placement Test					
Control	28.4	5			
Exper. I	29.57	7	.06	2, 24	ns
Exper. II	27.93	15			
Upperclass vs. Upperclass					
Verbal Skills					
Control	613.57	7			
Exper. I	543.50	2	.54	2, 16	ns
Exper. II	584.40	10			
Vocabulary Test					
Control	38.56	9			
Exper. I	31.33	3	1.27	2, 18	ns
Exper. II	33.89	9			
Antioch Language Pl. Test					
Control	28.5	2			
Exper. I	20.5	2	1.13	2, 7	ns
Exper. II	33.67	6			
Male-Female Distribution					
Male vs. Male					
Verbal Skills					
Control	624.14	7			
Exper. I	571.64	14	.77	2, 30	ns
Exper. II	592.58	12			
Vocabulary Test					
Control	33.40	10			
Exper. I	32.71	14	.02	2, 32	ns
Exper. II	32.91	11			
Antioch Language Pl. Test					
Control	27.00	3			
Exper. I	32.50	4	.26	2, 13	ns
Exper. II	28.11	9			

(continued)

Appendix, Table III cont'd.

Comparison	$\bar{X}$	N	F	df	Signif.
Male-Female Distribution, cont'd.					
Female vs. Female					
Verbal Skills					
Control	597.38	8			
Exper. I	578.00	11	.69	2, 38	ns
Exper. II	560.18	22			
Vocabulary Test					
Control	37.89	9			
Exper. I	31.42	12	1.32	2, 40	ns
Exper. II	31.45	22			
Antioch Language Pl. Test					
Control	29.5	4			
Exper. I	23.6	5	.97	2, 18	ns
Exper. II	30.67	12			
Background Experience in French					
Students With Some Background					
Verbal Skills					
Control	548.33	3			
Exper. I	513.25	4	.62	2, 25	ns
Exper. II	562.10	21			
Vocabulary Test					
Control	31.50	6			
Exper. I	24.40	5	1.40	2, 29	ns
Exper. II	31.90	21			
Students With No Background					
Verbal Skills					
Control	625.25	12			
Exper. I	586.10	21	.95	2, 43	ns
Exper. II	587.00	13			
Vocabulary Test					
Control	37.38	13			
Exper. I	33.95	21	.97	2, 43	ns
Exper. II	32.00	12			

TABLE IV

The Achievements of the Groups

Comparison	$\bar{X}$	N	F	df	Signif.
College Board Achievement Test in French Reading					
Control	429.73	15			
Exper. I	435.46	26	.11	2/72	ns
Exper. II	430.24	34			
Antioch Language Placement Test					
Control	45.29	14			
Exper. I	48.26	27	.32	2/72	ns
Exper. II	49.71	34			
Cooperative French Listening Test					
Control	181.71	14			
Exper. I	180.62	26	.71	2/71	ns
Exper. II	184.18	34			
Tape-Recorded Tests of Comprehension, Reading, and Speaking Ability					
Tape 1a: Correctness of Pronunciation					
Control	70.67	13			
Exper. I	74.40	25	1.45	2/69	ns
Exper. II	77.85	34			
Tape 1b: General Comprehension					
Control	4.15	13			
Exper. I	5.28	25	3.18	2/67	.05
Exper. II	5.09	32			
Tape 2: Response in Question and Answer Situations					
Control	29.77	13			
Exper. I	30.44	25	2.31	2/69	ns
Exper. II	39.00	34			
Tape 3: Extemporaneous Conversation (3 minutes)					
Control	21.92	13			
Exper. I	22.28	25	.05	2/69	ns
Exper. II	21.53	34			

TABLE V

Analyses of the Achievements of the Experimental and Control Classes by Subgroups Within Each Class

Va -- Standardized Instruments: College Board Achievement Test, Antioch Language Placement Test, and Cooperative French Listening Test.

Comparison	$\bar{X}$	N	F	df	Signif.
Year Level					
Freshmen vs. Freshmen					
College Board					
Control	428.00	9			
Exper. I	436.86	22	.16	2/52	ns
Exper. II	429.96	24			
Antioch Lang. Pl.					
Control	44.89	9			
Exper. I	48.57	23	.21	2/53	ns
Exper. II	49.33	24			
Co-op. French Listng. Test					
Control	178.67	9			
Exper. I	180.27	22	.84	2/52	ns
Exper. II	183.58	24			
Upperclass vs. Upperclass					
College Board					
Control	432.33	6			
Exper. I	427.75	4	.01	2/17	ns
Exper. II	430.9	10			
Antioch Lang. Pl.					
Control	46.0	5			
Exper. I	46.5	4	.13	2/16	ns
Exper. II	50.6	10			
Co-op. French List. Test					
Control	187.2	5			
Exper. I	182.5	4	.13	2/16	ns
Exper. II	185.6	10			
Male-Female Distribution					
Male vs. Male					
College Board					
Control	419.63	8			
Exper. I	432.29	14	.33	2/31	ns
Exper. II	417.00	12			
Antioch Lang. Pl.					
Control	45.29	7			
Exper. I	46.13	15	.07	2/31	ns
Exper. II	43.67	12			
Co-op French List. Test					
Control	176.75	8			
Exper. I	180.43	14	2.33	2/31	ns
Exper. II	188.5	12			

(continued)

Appendix, Table Va cont'd.

Comparison	$\bar{X}$	N	F	df	Signif.
Male-Female Distribution, cont'd.					
Female vs. Female					
College Board					
Control	441.29	7			
Exper. I	439.17	12	.02	2, 38	ns
Exper. II	437.45	22			
Antioch Lang. Pl.					
Control	45.29	7			
Exper. I	45.92	12	.73	2, 38	ns
Exper. II	53.00	22			
Co-op French List. Test					
Control	188.33	6			
Exper. I	180.83	12	1.14	2, 37	ns
Exper. II	181.82	22			
Background Experience in French					
Students With Some Background					
College Board					
Control	434.5	6			
Exper. I	439.20	5	.03	2, 29	ns
Exper. II	433.19	21			
Antioch Lang. Pl.					
Control	48.2	5			
Exper. I	58.4	5	.48	2, 28	ns
Exper. II	51.57	21			
Co-op French List. Test					
Control	182.	6			
Exper. I	183.2	5	.58	2, 29	ns
Exper. II	187.62	21			
Students with No Background					
College Board					
Control	426.56	9			
Exper. I	434.57	21	.18	2, 40	ns
Exper. II	425.46	13			
Antioch Lang. Pl.					
Control	43.67	9			
Exper. I	45.95	22	.08	2, 41	ns
Exper. II	46.69	13			
Co-op French List. Test					
Control	181.5	8			
Exper. I	180.0	21	.18	2, 39	ns
Exper. II	178.62	13			

Vb -- Tape-Recorded Tests of Comprehension, Reading, and Speaking Ability: 1a) Correctness of Pronunciation; 1b) General Comprehension; 2) Response in Question and Answer Situations; 3) Extemporaneous Conversation (3 minutes).

Comparison	$\bar{X}$	N	F	df	Signif.
Year Level					
Freshmen vs. Freshmen					
Tape 1a					
Control	65.56	9			
Exper. I	74.86	21	5.88	2/51	.01
Exper. II	77.79	24			
Tape 1b					
Control	3.56	9			
Exper. I	5.38	21	7.53	2/49	.01
Exper. II	5.09	22			
Tape 2					
Control	24.22	9			
Exper. I	32.05	21	2.45	2/51	ns
Exper. II	38.75	24			
Tape 3					
Control	19.44	9			
Exper. I	22.86	21	.32	2/51	ns
Exper. II	22.04	24			
Upperclass vs. Upperclass					
Tape 1a					
Control	82.25	4			
Exper. I	72.00	4	1.11	2/15	ns
Exper. II	78.00	10			
Tape 1b					
Control	5.5	4			
Exper. I	4.75	4	.30	2/15	ns
Exper. II	5.1	10			
Tape 2					
Control	42.25	4			
Exper. I	22.00	4	1.95	2/15	ns
Exper. II	39.6	10			
Tape 3					
Control	20.25	4			
Exper. I	22.25	4	.08	2/15	ns
Exper. II	20.3	10			
Male-Female Distribution					
Male vs. Male					
Tape 1a					
Control	76.86	7			
Exper. I	72.92	12	.86	2/28	ns
Exper. II	78.75	12			

(continued)

Appendix, Table Vb, cont'd.

Comparison	$\bar{X}$	N	F	df	Signif.
Male vs. Male, cont'd.					
Tape 1b					
Control	4.57	7			
Exper. I	5.42	12	.66	2, 28	ns
Exper. II	5.08	12			
Tape 2					
Control	28.57	7			
Exper. I	32.5	12	2.64	2, 28	ns
Exper. II	45.92	12			
Tape 3					
Control	23.14	7			
Exper. I	25.83	12	.57	2, 28	ns
Exper. II	21.42	12			
Female vs. Female					
Tape 1a					
Control	63.5	6			
Exper. I	75.77	13	1.99	2, 38	ns
Exper. II	77.36	22			
Tape 1b					
Control	3.67	6			
Exper. I	5.15	13	3.82	2, 36	.05
Exper. II	5.10	20			
Tape 2					
Control	31.17	6			
Exper. I	28.54	13	.67	2, 38	ns
Exper. II	35.23	22			
Tape 3					
Control	20.5	6			
Exper. I	19.0	13	.39	2, 38	ns
Exper. II	21.59	22			
Background Experience in French					
Students with Some Background					
Tape 1a					
Control	66.86	7			
Exper. I	74.33	9	1.25	2, 34	ns
Exper. II	78.57	21			
Tape 1b					
Control	4.14	7			
Exper. I	5.67	9	2.33	2, 33	ns
Exper. II	5.25	20			
Tape 2					
Control	33.71	7			
Exper. I	31.44	9	2.22	2, 34	ns
Exper. II	43.95	21			
Tape 3					
Control	23.71	7			
Exper. I	22.0	9	.15	2, 34	ns
Exper. II	21.38	21			

(continued)

Appendix, Table Vb, cont'd.

Comparison	$\bar{X}$	N	F	df	Signif.
Background Experience in French, cont'd.					
Students with No Background					
Tape 1a					
Control	75.17	6			
Exper. I	74.44	16	.28	2 32	ns
Exper. II	76.69	13			
Tape 1b					
Control	4.17	6			
Exper. I	5.06	16	1.10	2 31	ns
Exper. II	4.83	12			
Tape 2					
Control	25.17	6			
Exper. I	29.88	16	.24	2 32	ns
Exper. II	31.00	13			
Tape 3					
Control	19.83	6			
Exper. I	22.44	16	.18	2 32	ns
Exper. II	21.77	13			

TABLE VI

Gain Scores of Experimental and Control Groups
on the Antioch Language Placement Test

Comparison	$\bar{X}$	N	F	df	Signif.
Control	16.36	7			
Exper I	30.67	9	2.41	2	ns
Exper. II	22.2	21		34	

TABLE VII

Student Attitudes Toward the Control and Experimental Procedures

Comparison	$\bar{X}$	S^2	N	t	df	Signif.
1. Presents what he has to say clearly, at your level of understanding						
Control	2.64	.84	11	.59	41	ns
Exper. II	2.44	1.24	31	.18	46	ns
Exper. I	2.50	1.27	16			
2. Displays an active personal interest in you, as by being easy to approach, willing to help						
Control	1.54	.48	11	2.19	41	.01
Exper. II	2.13	.98	31	.36	46	ns
Exper. I	2.25	1.41	16			
3. Gets you interested in his subject						
Control	2.09	1.29	11	1.10	41	ns
Exper. II	2.53	1.44	31	2.79	46	.01
Exper. I	1.75	.56	16			
4. Makes learning active for you, as by stimulating thinking, encouraging participation, guiding discussion						
Control	2.27	1.63	11	.33	41	ns
Exper. II	2.13	1.23	31	.32	46	ns
Exper. I	2.00	2.07	16			
5. Knows subject thoroughly enough to organize course and relate it to others; integrates materials, answers questions						
Control	2.64	1.44	11	1.60	40	.05
Exper. II	2.00	.97	31	.02	46	ns
Exper. I	2.06	1.27	16			
6. Over-all Rating						
Control	11.45	1.03	11	.29	41	ns
Exper. II	11.25	1.23	31	.56	46	ns
Exper. I	10.56	1.80	16			

Survey of Student Opinion of Teaching

NAME OF INSTRUCTOR | COURSE AND NUMBER | CREDIT

YOUR FIELD | YEAR IN COLLEGE | YOUR SIGNATURE

The main task of the college is teaching. It is of first importance that the college be continuously informed of the quality of its teaching and the respects in which that teaching can be improved. Students are in a position to judge the quality of teaching from direct experience.

You are being asked to indicate your opinion of your instructor in this course. In order to do so, first fill in the blanks with the names of five teachers you have had at Antioch, not including your instructor in this course. Choose one who is most satisfactory, one who is above average, one who is average, one whose teaching is below average, one whose teaching is least satisfactory. Write in these names in the order of their total effectiveness as teachers from best to poorest. Be sure to fill in every space, using a different name in each one.

MOST SATISFACTORY:
ABOVE AVERAGE:
AVERAGE:
BELOW AVERAGE:
LEAST SATISFACTORY:

You are to compare your instructor in this class with the five teachers you have just listed. Draw a circle around the number that indicates his position with respect to the other five. His name will make the sixth, so that he can be assigned any number from 1 (better than anyone on the list) to 6 poorer than anyone on the list).

Do this for each of the five qualities, making each answer a separate judgment. Obviously in only extremely rare cases will the circled number be the same for all qualities.

1. Gets you interested in his subject..... 1 2 3 4 5 6

2. Makes learning active for you, as by stimulating thinking, encouraging participation, guiding discussion..... 1 2 3 4 5 6

3. Knows subject thoroughly enough to organize course and relate it to others, integrate material, answer questions.... 1 2 3 4 5 6

4. Displays an active, personal interest in you as by being easy to approach, patient, willing to help..... 1 2 3 4 5 6

5. Presents what he has to say clearly, at your level of understanding..... 1 2 3 4 5 6

Write in your own words your general comment on his teaching in this course (use the back of the sheet, also, if you wish).

APPENDIX C

Background Data Sheet

Name_____ Age_____ Sex_____

High School (last attended)_____

1. Did you have French in Elementary School? yes no

2. If your answer was YES to (1), how long did you have French?

_____
years months

3. Did you take French in Junior High School? yes no

4. If your answer was YES to (3), how long did you take French?

_____
years months

5. Did you take French in Senior High School? yes no

6. If your answer was YES to (5), how long did you take French?

_____
courses (levels)

7. Have you ever traveled in French speaking countries? yes no

8. To what extent? _____

9. Did you learn to speak the language? no slightly moderately fluently

10. Do your parents speak French? Mother yes no
Father yes no

11. Do you speak French at home? yes no

12. Do you speak any language besides English at home? yes no

13. If you answer YES to (12), which other language(s) do you speak at home? _____

14. Have you taken private lessons in French? yes no

15. If your answer was YES to (14), how much French did you cover?

_____

16. Can you read French? no slightly moderately fluently

17. Is there any other information that would help us in evaluating the experiences you have had in modern foreign languages? Please elaborate.